

MUNGER AFRICANA



LIBRARY
NOTES

2

Notes from the Munger Africana Library, issued occasionally, are eclectic within the field of Africana. They include unpublished historical documents, current field research reports, significant statistics gathered in the field, library-based analysis, and other material deemed useful to Africanists.

Most of the material will be generated from the library and from work in progress at the California Institute of Technology by faculty, distinguished visitors, and research assistants.

The Editorial Advisory Committee is drawn from Africanists at the Institute who have themselves published research on African topics. They include: Robert Bates (PhD MIT) Political Science; Margaret Rouse Bates (MA Harvard) Political Science; Kenneth Frederick (PhD MIT) Economics; Robert Huttenback (PhD UCLA) History; Edwin Munger (PhD Chicago) Political Geography, Editor; Robert Oliver (PhD Princeton) Economics. Thayer Scudder (PhD. Harvard) Anthropology
Assistant Editors: Monique Le Blanc (MA UCLA) African Studies; Joanne Goldmann (BA CSCLA) English.
Bibliographer: Edith Fisher (BA CSCLA)
Business Manager: Kathie Marcum

Needless to say, viewpoints expressed in these occasional notes are solely the responsibility of the individual authors and may or may not have the concurrence of the editorial advisory committee. We seek exposure of facts and ideas, not the dissemination of dogma.

Correspondence should be addressed to:
The Munger Africana Library
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Subscriptions are \$10 a year. Prices of individual issues vary, but the total cost of all single issues during the year will be in excess of \$10.

MUNGER AFRICANA LIBRARY NOTES

March 1971

Two Dollars

#2

SOUTH AFRICA: THREE VISITORS REPORT

The three reports in this issue demonstrate, but by no means exhaust, the variety of scope by which South Africa can be approached by thoughtful Americans. Dr. George Kennan of the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton is a distinguished historian. His brilliant career as a diplomat included service as the American Ambassador in Moscow. His report was written after his third visit to southern Africa, but he clearly emphasized during personal conversation that his knowledge of South Africa does not approach that of his long study of the Communist world. Leon Gordenker, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, is essentially a student of international organizations. He and his family lived at Makerere College in Uganda before going to South Africa, a fact which gave a special perspective to their visit there. Dr. Wilton Dillon is an anthropologist with an exceptionally broad knowledge of field study, ranging from Japan to France to Ghana. He is currently with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. Previously, he was with the Phelps Stokes Foundation, where he was intimately concerned with problems of race relations in the United States, and then he was long associated with the Office of the Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Science responsible for science relations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

During a vis-à-vis discussion of their reports, Kennan and Gordenker agreed that the racial situation in South Africa is both complex and difficult, and they favor more, rather than less, contact with the outside world. However, they differed in the choice of mechanism by which Americans and the American government might bring this about. Gordenker sees white South Africans as feeling increasingly alone in a hostile world from which they are inclined to withdraw in order to avoid as much unpleasant friction as possible. He finds the South African white establishment quite unrealistic about the rest of the world in general and

about developments on the African continent in particular. While he favors more outside contact, he does feel that controls by the South African government do not help. This, Gordenker says, is especially true of the Social Sciences. He feels that South Africa would be better understood by the United States if American scholars felt free to go to South Africa to carry out long range research and then be confident that, after publishing their results, they would be free to return there. Similarly, he believes South African social scientists feel that they cannot publish as freely as they would wish, either about their visits to the United States or about issues within South Africa itself. As a result, Gordenker is forced into a position which might be described as "painful" for a liberal American academic. He must advocate restrictions on visits of South Africans to the United States to be used as a lever in order to achieve the reciprocity of free access and publishing which he believes to be in the best interests of both countries. It was clear from the outline of Professor Gordenker's thoughts that, after their residence in Uganda, he and his family have never quite recovered from the shock of their "plunge into the cold waters of South Africa," where so many contacts across racial lines were so difficult. Also, it seems doubtful Gordenker would ever wish to "recover," if to do so meant having to approve the status quo in South Africa.

Professor Kennan was less shocked by what he observed on this, his third trip, to South Africa, but he clearly felt that "to anyone raised with traditional American values the situation is nothing less than tragic." In principle, Kennan has nothing against the Bantustan concept of giving various African ethnic groups their own territories and full economic and political rights within them. He does not consider it necessary for South Africa to be "homogenized" in order to be happy. But he is highly critical of what he termed the continued "pretense" that the presence of millions of Africans in the major industrial centers of South Africa is a "temporary" condition. A permanent situation in which Africans cannot own their homes, plan their children's education, or look forward to spending a secure old age in a place where they have always lived is not at all satisfactory.

Dr. Kennan is critical, however, of the official American approach to South Africa and particularly of that adopted by a majority of U. S. scholars. He cites the presence of leaders in South Africa who are "sincere and valuable people." All of the people, whatever their pigmentation, are caught in a situation which none of them have created by themselves, and isolation will not help them to find the necessary solutions. Neither will economic failure, which might be brought about through the use of sanctions, be of aid to them. Kennan deplores the "appalling" wage

differential between white and black and would like to see a narrowing of the gap. But he is convinced that a collapse of the whole economic system in South Africa would be a tragedy and cause much suffering for whites and blacks alike, who are so inextricably mixed economically, particularly in the large cities such as Johannesburg.

It is Kennan's opinion that Americans do not understand the situation in South Africa, and, therefore, they should be chary of offering specific advice to South Africans. In the first place, the racial situations in the two countries are not comparable. Secondly, advice from an America whose own hands are far from clean in its provision of justice for black Americans does not carry much weight. Even if America proves successful in curing its own illnesses, Kennan maintains that this would not necessarily mean that it could accurately prescribe for the illnesses of others. He takes the historians view that there are problems which at the time they occur are unsolvable. In answer to the argument by some black observers of South Africa that conditions there could not grow worse (an argument, however, which is disputed by other black American observers), Kennan referred to his years in Moscow where, he said, Joe Stalin taught the Soviet people one thing -- when you think life can't get any harder, it can. Therefore, he feels that any short-range solutions for improvements might have much worse long-range implications.

Dr. Kennan would like a situation where Americans would report frankly and bluntly to South Africans their reactions to conditions in South Africa. But Americans should credit Afrikaners with having "human decency" and not tend to expel them from the human race as some kind of "moral monsters." For these reasons, Kennan strongly favors the maximum exchange of both ideas and people between the United States and South Africa, but without the restrictive proposals made by Professor Gordenker.

* * *

The visits to South Africa of all three men were underwritten and planned by the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program. Over the past twelve years, this non-profit organization has arranged for the exchange of more than 200 people between the two countries, including people of all racial groupings and widely varying political persuasions from both countries. The General Secretary of the Program, Rev. James Brewer, was instrumental in aiding the integration of schools in Norfolk, Virginia. Then, on a grant from the Crane-Rogers Foundation, he lived for two years in South Africa. Subsequently, he had the opportunity to observe life in east and west Africa, followed by a study residence in Brazil.

The Leader Exchange Program, which receives no government

funds from either the United States or South Africa, but is entirely supported by gifts, has shifted its focus recently to emphasize semiannual symposia with African themes. At the most recent one, held at Churchill College in Cambridge, the four days of discussions involved a wide range of views. Participants included influential white South Africans, who staunchly support their government, and white South Africans, who moderately or strenuously oppose it. It included black South Africans who live inside South Africa, representing both traditional and modern society, as well as a black South African scholar, who is now in political exile. The black and white American participants, also representative of a wide occupational spectrum, held sharply divergent views on American policy towards South Africa.

The following reports are reproduced with the authors' permission and that of the Leader Exchange Program, 41 West Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut 06830. Their reports appear in these NOTES because they constitute Africana of scholarly interest to a wider audience.

ESM

REPORT ON PROFESSOR AND MRS. GEORGE F. KENNAN'S
VISIT TO SOUTH AFRICA AND SOUTH WEST AFRICA

The idea of this third journey to Southern Africa arose, in my mind, from the recognition that the earlier two visits had left serious gaps that needed to be filled if I was to arrive at any rounded view of the problems of the region as a whole. It was not just South Africa but the entire sub-Zambesian and sub-Congolian Africa which, for reasons to be explained presently, engaged my curiosity. My earlier visits, however, had taken me neither to Angola, nor to South West Africa, nor to any of the former High Commission territories. I was anxious not only to fill these gaps to the extent that time permitted, but to get another glimpse of South Africa. Three years had passed since my earlier visit there. I wanted not only to bring my previous impressions up to date but also, if possible, to deepen them by a further acquaintance with the South African scene. I am very glad, in retrospect, that I made this decision. I feel that I got more out of this last visit, having a better background of information to start with and knowing better what questions to ask, than I did out of the first one.

* * *

I might, I think, say a word at this point about the nature of my interest in Southern Africa as a whole. It is in the broader sense a political one. I am, as an historian, equally skeptical of the exceptional virtues often attributed to large bodies of people by themselves, and of the exceptional iniquities attributed to them by their enemies. I believe, as a matter of personal philosophy, that whereas individuals are endowed by their Creator with the burden of moral choice, which permits their conduct to be judged accordingly, large masses of people, politically organized, tend to react rather to the discipline of the objective conditions in which they are placed, and their conduct must be measured and judged from a more objective and less personal standpoint. This being the case, I have been intrigued by the sweeping moral condemnation of the white populations of Southern Africa on the part of most of the western liberal world, not to mention the various Communist regimes. It has seemed to me that such judgments must involve serious over-simplifications, if not injustices; and I have been anxious to test the validity of this assumption.

Secondly, I am -- as no thoughtful American can fail to be -- deeply concerned with the problem of race, which represents America's

most long-standing and recalcitrant, if not its deepest, national problem; and since this is, or is at least alleged to be, the principal problem of public life throughout most of Southern Africa, I have been anxious to gain an understanding of race relations there -- not that the lessons derived from such an understanding would normally be directly applicable to American conditions but that they might help to throw light on similar problems in our country.

Finally, on this last occasion, I had one object of curiosity which was much more actively on my mind this time than during the previous visits. I had just published, on the eve of my departure for Africa, a major article on the need for an international environmental authority. The problems with which this article dealt were primarily those of the major industrial and maritime countries. They were ones by which South Africa, as a highly-developed industrial country, could not fail to be importantly affected. I hoped, this time, to get a better idea of the extent to which South Africa was exposed to the problems of industrial and urban pollution, of the responses this was evoking on the part of public authority, and of the interest of South African circles in the possibilities for tackling environmental problems at the international level.

It was with these questions on my mind that I undertook this last journey to the Southern part of Africa.

* * *

The days in South West Africa were a rewarding and profitable experience. We appreciated them particularly because they gave us the opportunity to become personally acquainted, in a degree which the earlier journey had not permitted, with persons of Afrikaner origin and viewpoints. We came away with a much better understanding of the depth and complexity of the Afrikaner experience; and while we remained aware of what seemed to us certain real blind spots in the Afrikaner appreciation of racial problems, we were moved and impressed by the personal qualities of the people we met: by their warmth of character, their generous hospitality, their deep religious sincerity, their keen sense of humor, and their vigor and competence in the development of this vast and interesting territory.

In the course of our visit to South West Africa, we enjoyed and appreciated the personal hospitality of a number of people, including several officials of the South African administration.

I paid formal calls, in Windhoek, on the Secretary for South

West Africa, Mr. J. J. Klopper; on the Administrator, Mr. J. G. H. van der Wath; and on the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner, Mr. J. van der Watt; and I was courteously and helpfully received by all of them.

Mrs. Kennan and I visited the so-called Augustinium, the great combined boarding-school, trade school and teacher's college for non-whites in the neighborhood of Windhoek and were much impressed with the seriousness and efficiency with which it was obviously being administered.

Alone, without Mrs. Kennan, I visited the Central Prison, also on the edge of town. It made an excellent impression for good order, cleanliness, and firm, sensible management. I am sure it would have compared favorably with 95% of similar institutions in my own country. Not even the unforgettable sight of a single woebegone black figure squatting disconsolately on the floor of the dark cell in death row (reflecting a problem by no means peculiar to South Africa) could diminish the favorable impression of the prison as a whole. I could have derived greater comfort from this impression, however, had I not known that political offenders were handled elsewhere, and had I been able to forget that a number of these latter were at that time being detained indefinitely in other South African prisons, and had been so detained for several months, even though the charges against them had already been dismissed by the courts.

I also visited, on the same afternoon, the Bantu Township of Katutura which flanks the city of Windhoek: a miniature edition of the Soweto Township near Johannesburg. Conditions here, and in the Coloured community we drove past on the way back, seemed to me a bit more encouraging than those in Soweto, insofar as people were permitted here, as I understood it, to own their own homes and thus to make some provision for their own future and for that of their children. With the exception of the Coloureds (for reasons I shall note below), there is nothing that offends me on principle in the creation of separate suburban communities for these various racial groups. I am sure that most of them would prefer, in any case, to live side by side with people of their own racial origin and culture. Everything depends, as I see it, on the manner in which the concept is carried into effect. If there are certain aspects of the present procedure that strike the American visitor as unnecessarily harsh, he is obliged to remind himself of the bitterness of the problem with which these devices attempt to deal, and of the failure of most large urban American communities to find, to date, any very satisfactory answer to a similar challenge.

The period from April 21 to 25 was taken up largely with a trip to Tsumeb and Ovamboland. After flying to Tsumeb and visiting the

great copper-zinc-lead mine there, we motored on, northwards, crossed the Ovamboland frontier and spent the night at Andangwa, where we were kindly taken in as personal guests by the Chief Director for Ovamboland, Mr. Duprey, and his charming wife. The following morning, I paid a formal call on the Chief Counselor for Ovamboland, the senior elected Ovambo official, who received me with dignity and courtesy. Mr. Marais and I then continued our journey northwards to the place that is, if I understood correctly, eventually to be the permanent administrative center for Ovamboland -- Onguediva. There, I had a long and interesting talk with the senior officials of the local branch of the Bantu Investment Company; and we visited certain of the enterprises which the company has financed: a furniture and wood-working plant, a self-service wholesale distributing center, and a block of retail stores, etc. In the afternoon we visited the large water-reservoirs which have been and are being built to serve the needs not just of Ovamboland but also of other parts of South West Africa, and then, finally, the excellent hospital and nurses' training center which serves as the chief medical center for the territory and which is, I am sure, one of the finest establishments of this nature that one could find anywhere in Africa.

On the return journey to Windhoek, all by motor car, we stopped overnight at the hotel in Tsumeb, and I had another opportunity to see this interesting and modern little mining town, which must, I think, be very similar to what one could find, in the way of similar communities, in the American West.

Before leaving South West Africa, on the 25th, I had interviews with several individuals, including: (1), the editor of the local German paper; (2), a German friend whose husband owns a large farm some 200 miles northwest of Windhoek; and (3), the Diocesan Secretary of the Anglican Church who was officiating in Bishop Winter's absence and to whom I had been recommended by friends at home.

I may say that I carried away from my visit to South West Africa a generally favorable impression of the effort put forward by the South African authorities in the administration and development of this great territory. The concentration of so much of the native population along the northern border, the relatively well-watered and hospitable nature of that northern region, and the fact that Ovamboland, in particular, is able to provide a home for so large a proportion of the Ovambos: all these factors seemed to me to provide a relatively favorable background for the operation of the homelands policy; and there can be no question but that South Africa, as the nearest industrially-developed nation and as one with long experience in handling the problems of the area, is peculiarly

well fitted to lead the further development of this territory. There are still certain aspects of the application of the policies of separate development in the neighborhood of the larger urban communities that grate on the sensibilities of the American visitor and strike him as excessive and unnecessary; but the reproach contained in the United Nations resolutions, to the effect that South Africa had "failed to ensure the . . . material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa" seems to me to be extremely unjust; and the demand that South Africa abandon at once its administration of the territory and hand it over immediately to U. N. administration -- to be unrealistic and frivolous, precisely from the standpoint of the interests of the native population. One may continue to hope, as I myself do, that a higher ceiling of opportunity and freedom of choice will soon be provided for the non-white population of South West Africa as for the similar population of the Republic; but it is difficult to believe that any changes of a social or political nature that an international administration might introduce could conceivably balance off the economic disaster, particularly for the non-white population, which an abrupt removal of the South African administration would unquestionably involve. It seems to me that the best chances for the improvement of the situation of the non-whites in South West Africa lie with the ultimate recognition by the South African authorities that many of the restrictions to which these people are now subject (and I am thinking in this connection primarily of those who live outside the homelands and of those, both in the homelands and without, who aspire to higher education and to more responsible positions in business, administrative or professional life) are unnecessarily onerous and not essential to the successful operation of the policies of separate development. I am including this statement in my report because I shall presumably have to say something similar in any public statements I may have occasion to make.

* * *

The days from April 25 to April 29 were spent in Cape Town. This was a very quiet part of the trip, partly because of the intervention of a week-end which we used for rest and the writing of notes, and partly because of illness. It was a source of much disappointment to me that I was unable, for various reasons, to attend a luncheon given for Mrs. Kennan and myself by the Principal of the University, Sir Richard Luyt, and to take advantage of an opportunity to drive out to Stellenbosch, as the guest of Dr. A. D. Wassenaar, and meet with Dr. Anton Rupert, and to attend a dinner kindly arranged for me by the South African Foundation. I did, however, manage necessary medical attention, which put me in shape to complete the remainder of my journey. I also, while in Cape Town, spent a most pleasant evening as the guest of the Owl Club, whose members I addressed on the subject of the state of my own country. Professor and Mrs.

Eric Axelson repeated the great kindness they showed us on the occasion of our first visit, three years ago, and gave us a lovely afternoon of driving in the vicinity of Cape Town. We were able, finally, to pay another visit to Dr. Richard van der Ross and his family at their home in the Cape Coloured Township.

I was particularly grateful for this opportunity to have another glimpse of the Cape Coloured community and to learn something of the changes that had occurred in its life and situation since our last visit. I am sure that I am not the first American to take a special interest in this particular element of the South African population, whose situation, and whose relationship to the white community, in particular, is much more similar to that of our American Negroes than is the case with the Bantu. I was glad to note the visible evidences of improvement in the material conditions of the Coloured residential section, and I am sure that they have been accompanied in many ways by other forms of progress and improvement. I have discussed the position and treatment of the Cape Coloureds with many of my South African friends; and there has been no lack of effort to explain to me the rationale of the official South African policy towards them. I still find myself wondering whether there is not a certain inconsistency, not to speak of injustice, in the inclusion of these people, who have no culture, no language, and no remembered historical tradition greatly different from that of the whites of the Cape, and many of whom are scarcely darker than a great many of their "white" fellow-citizens, under the restrictions of separate development. Their present situation does not, in any case, seem to me to do justice to talents and capacities that many of them exhibit; and the persistent tendency to emigration on the part of those who reach higher levels of educational and professional attainment would seem to me to stand as evidence that the existing situation is not even in general South African interests, and particularly not in the interests of the successful realization of the aims of the policy of separate development itself. I came away unshaken in the impression that here, at least, is one element of racial policy which the South African authorities will some day find it in their own interests to re-examine.

* * *

The next place Mrs. Kennan and I visited was Lesotho. Although this visit, too, was not strictly speaking a part, I suppose, of the itinerary for which the Exchange Program was responsible, my program there was partly arranged by the Lesotho Development Corporation, which functions under South African leadership, and the South African interest in the country is so obvious and inescapable that I might just say a word about it.

This ravaged, eroded territory, so poor in natural resources and developmental possibilities, struck me as one of the most tragic examples of the combination of over-population and man-made damage to natural environment. I met a number of the Lesothan political leaders and cabinet members. They were without exception intelligent, well-educated men, obviously entirely capable -- whatever their interne political difficulties of the moment -- of giving the country effective administrative leadership. It was abundantly clear, however, that if the country has any hopeful economic future at all in these coming decades, it is only in closest economic association with South Africa. It shares, in its over-grazed, over-populated state, and particularly in its inability to provide a living for a goodly proportion of its own population, many of the problems of the homelands of the Republic proper; and it seemed obvious to me that as these homelands -- or certain of them at least -- approach the higher stages of autonomy and eventually independence, their situation will come more and more to resemble that of Lesotho, and the questions of policy involved in the relationship of the central South African authorities to one and the other will tend to become a common problem. Even more than in the case of certain of the homelands, Lesotho lies at the very geographic heart of South Africa; and the bitter problem of its development, while in the political sense of course ultimately the responsibility of its own government, is one for which South African statesmanship will long have to shoulder a good portion of the burden.

* * *

On May 1, we proceeded to Johannesburg, and made that city our base of operations for the remaining fortnight of our stay in Southern Africa.

The first week, roughly, was spent in and around Johannesburg and Pretoria. We were privately and charmingly entertained by a considerable number of people, to all of whom we feel a heavy debt of gratitude. In the course of these pleasant occasions we met a large number of South African fellow-guests, many of them people of distinction and of much prominence in the official, business, and other communities. No one, I think, could have had access to a better informed and more authoritative group of people, and I am not unappreciative of the courtesy shown me in making it possible for me to meet them and to talk with them in this informal way.

On a number of these occasions, I was asked to speak to the group as a whole and to share with them my impressions of South Africa, This I did, with complete frankness; and I did not hesitate, in view of the

nature of the occasions, to include critical impressions with the favorable ones. Without exception I was moved and impressed with the patient and thoughtful hearing given to what I had to say. I was aware that I was often speaking of matters about which my hosts and fellow-guests knew much more than I did. I was also well aware of the delicacy always involved when a foreigner speaks to people about conditions in their own country. But I must say that whatever ignorance I may have revealed, and however wide of the mark may have been some of my observations, my South African friends were always courteous enough to repress any impatience they may have felt, and not once was there an unpleasant or a sharp rejoinder.

On May 6 I delivered a public lecture at Witwatersrand University, the content of which (it concerned present conditions in my own country) was extensively reported in the Johannesburg press. The lecture was attended by some 700-800 people and was listened to more quietly and patiently, I think, than would have been possible, under the circumstances, at any American or English university.

On May 5, we spent a morning at the Bantu Township of Soweto, where we had spent some interesting hours during our earlier journey. We visited, this time, a number of the facilities of the Township, including one of the excellent day-nurseries established and run by private initiative. We were pleased to note here, as in the case of the Coloured community near Cape Town, the visible evidences of greater prosperity throughout much of the township, a situation which only confirmed what we already knew of the statistical indices on the rise of personal income among the Bantus. I was impressed once more with the magnitude of the effort put forward by the South African authorities, particularly in housing construction and in the provision of educational facilities. Observing these things, I felt myself wishing, at times, that I could tell my American liberal friends that when we in America had built for the present inhabitants of the New York ghetto a suburban community of 80,000 individual homes and had provided for them a 2,500-bed hospital where all hospitalization and medical costs could be had for a total of \$0.70 for the entire period of hospitalization, then we could begin, perhaps, to criticize the South African handling of the problem of the urban Bantu. On the other hand, in the case of many of the phenomena one encounters in South Africa, the judgment depends on the perspective from which one views it; and on this occasion, even more than on the last one, I was struck by what seemed to me to be the irrationalism involved, and the hardships worked, by adherence to the implausible theory of the temporary nature of the presence of these hundreds of thousands of black Africans in the municipal area of Johannesburg. It seemed to me, as I

am sure it has to other visitors, that if only this fiction could be abandoned, it should be possible to make many adjustments in the treatment of these non-whites which would make it easier for them to plan for their own future and that of their children and would release, for the development of the Township and for the improvement of the Johannesburg area as a whole, great reserves of energy and of economic initiative, now repressed and thrust into unhealthy channels. I was, in other words, as I came away from this visit, not unaware of the magnitude of the problems the South African authorities had faced in the effort to create decent living facilities for this great non-white urban population around Johannesburg, and not lacking in respect for the effort they had put forward to meet these problems; but I had to ask myself whether these authorities were not themselves the victims of theories put forward and adopted long ago which had outworn their relevance to existing conditions, and whether they were not for this reason -- to use an American expression -- in many respects "fighting the problem."

* * *

Some of the most interesting hours of our entire visit to South Africa were those spent at the great Scientia center of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, on the outskirts of Pretoria. The visit to the center had been kindly arranged by the Exchange Program in order to give me an opportunity to inform myself about South African problems in the field of pollution and environmental destruction and to get some idea of what was being done in the line of their correction and control. Mrs. Kennan accompanied me on this visit and shared my enthusiasm for the interest and profit it afforded. We were both naturally impressed with the great physical size and obvious intellectual power of this institution, which is certainly one of the world's great scientific centers. We were received there first by Mr. J. G. Herbst of the Information and Research Services; then, by Dr. G. J. Stander, Director of the National Institute for Water Research, and, finally by Dr. E. C. Holliday, of the Air Pollution Research Group. I am sorry I did not have time to make detailed notes on the briefings we were given by these gentlemen, for they were both informative and authoritative.

It is clear that South Africa, like every other highly industrialized and urbanized society, has serious environmental problems. These problems are in some respects different in the South African case than they are in others, specific determining factors being the great distances separating the major urban communities, the absence of other major industrial centers in the Southern Hemisphere, and the relative paucity of fresh water resources. On the other hand, I doubt that there is any advanced industrial

nation which is better equipped scientifically and technologically to deal with these problems or which is approaching them more thoughtfully and intelligently. I would think that the automobile, as the greatest single force of population in modern industrial society, is probably going to be South Africa's greatest environmental problem of the next two or three decades. It will require something in the way of a revolution in urban transportation to cut down the use of the internal-combustion vehicle in the congested urban areas and to replace it with various means of public transport. The shortage of hydroelectric power also presents a number of environmental problems insofar as it tends to throw the burden of power production onto thermal and nuclear facilities, both of which involve serious environmental dangers.

The second impression I took away from this visit to the Scientia Center was a sense of the importance of the inclusion of South Africa in any international undertaking or organization that may be set up to deal with environmental problems at the international level. The significance of the inclusion of South African scientists in any such international effort is well illustrated by the present position of Dr. Stander as head of the international Scientific Committee on Water Research. That the inclusion of South Africa in an eventual international environmental authority will present political problems is only to be expected; but to the extent that such an authority can be based on a scientific, rather than a political, representation, as I myself have urged, one may hope that this difficulty can be overcome.

* * *

Some of the last days in the Johannesburg area were used for a drive to Pietersburg and the Kruger Game Park. The reasons for this expedition, which was the result of my own initiative, were two: first, to see, if I could, the Bantu university near Pietersburg; and secondly, to take advantage of a long holiday week-end (it included Ascension Day), when people were apt to be away from Johannesburg, in order to see a part of South Africa which I had never seen. The first of these purposes proved impracticable, partly for limitations of time, and partly because the holiday weekend, again, made it a poor moment to see anything of the working of the University. (We did drive through the grounds and had in this way some glimpses of the buildings and the students.) But the second purpose, was richly achieved. The journey across the high veldt northeast of Johannesburg enabled us to see, at least from the road, a type of Transvaal farming country which we had read much about but had never before seen in the flesh. We were amazed and fascinated by what we saw of the great well-watered and wooded slopes of the Eastern Escarpment,

providing as they did so great a contrast with the remainder of the Republic, then suffering from the greatest drought of recorded history. We were truly impressed with the size of the Kruger Park and the excellence of its management, and were made aware for the first time of the magnitude of the contribution South Africa is making to the preservation of the wild life and nature of the continent by the maintenance of this rich and enormous reserve.

* * *

The last two full days of our stay in Southern Africa were used for a side-trip to Botswana. I am grateful to the Exchange Program for its collaboration in making this trip possible. The experience was a pleasant one, and most interesting. The situation in Botswana differs greatly, of course, from that which exists in Lesotho -- primarily in the fact that Botswana does, whereas Lesotho does not, have promising prospects for economic development and eventual self-sufficiency; and while it is to be hoped, in my opinion, that South Africa will take an active and constructive part in this development, there is no reason that the degree of dependence on South Africa should ever be as great as it must be in the case of Lesotho. It seems to me that Botswana, given an adequate degree of latitude by its neighbors, and with a continuation of the present wise and prudent leadership, should be able to develop into a useful bridge between the other countries of South Africa and countries further north, impeding the dangerous tendency towards total bipolarity, and frustrating any and all efforts to seek sweeping, oversimplified and black-and-white solutions to the complex problems of the area. I have the impression that most responsible South Africans recognize this, and that they realize the importance of having, as a neighbor in that particular location, a political entity so constituted and so inspired as is the present Botswana. For this reason, I find unjustified and unfortunate the tendency of the press, both in Africa and elsewhere, to try to dramatize alleged South African fears about the construction of a north-south highway in Botswana and to conjure up the impression of a South African threat to that territory.

* * *

This completes the account of our actual journey in Southern Africa.

Since I shall now presumably be publishing in one form or another the general impressions I have derived from all these visits, I shall not attempt to summarize these impressions here. But there are certain aspects of them that have a particular relation to the purposes of

the Exchange Program, and these I should like to mention.

I did not need this last visit to make me aware of the complexity of South Africa's problems; but I think that as a result of this last journey I understand the nature of those problems much better than I did before. As my friends in South Africa know, I view these problems as being of an essentially tragic nature -- the products, that is, of a peculiarly difficult and tangled historical heritage of which the present generation of South Africans, both white and black, should be regarded as at least in part the victims rather than the authors, and also in part a reflection of the almost universal problem of modern over-population.

This being the case, I naturally do not share the self-righteous anger and hostility, based as it is on the most sweeping oversimplifications, that animates so much of western liberal sentiment with relation to South Africa. The criticism that derives from this source is so ill-informed, in part so extensively influenced by ulterior motives, that I am quite prepared to agree with Major General Sir Francis de Guingand when he, "whilst agreeing that some relaxation in discrimination and the opening up of greater opportunities to the non-white groups would meet some criticism," points out that this "would do little to satisfy the hard core of the anti-South African, anti-apartheid organizations."

There are, however, two points in this connection which South Africans themselves would do well, it seems to me, to bear in mind.

The first is that there are certain aspects to the racial regime now in force in South Africa which are repugnant to general trends of feeling in the modern western world about the way in which men may be treated by other men, and which are likely to grate on the sensibilities of even the most sympathetic western visitor. So long as these conditions exist, they are bound to constitute a significant burden on South Africa's relations with other western countries, and to place certain limitations on what even the most well-intentioned friend of South Africa can do to promote understanding and sympathy for that country elsewhere in the world.

This unhappy state of affairs is not altered by the fact that a double standard is often applied to South Africa by its foreign critics. It is, I know, a temptation to South Africans to claim immunity from the sort of reaction I have just mentioned, on the grounds that even greater injustices, when committed in other countries, pass without any comparable violence of reaction in western opinion. This is undoubtedly true. The reasons for it could be the subject of a special study in themselves. They

are not necessarily discreditable to South Africa. Perhaps more is expected of South Africans than of other people. However that may be, the fact remains that South African racial policies, as now conceived and enforced, are bound to strike even the most thoughtful and sympathetic foreigner as unfeeling and unrealistic, clearly inadequate to certain basic human needs of the non-whites, and questionable in their relationship to the long-term needs of the whites themselves. And so long as this is so, it is idle for South Africa to hope for, and expect, a fully normal relationship with her partners in the western community.

Secondly, the fact that much western criticism of South Africa is ignorant and unjust, and could not be satisfied in any reasonable way, cannot be held to absolve South Africans, or even their friends in other countries, from a serious concern with the very real problems that South Africa now faces. While these problems will certainly not be solved either under the pressure of foreigners or primarily on the advice of foreigners, they will also not be solved wholly in isolation. Their solution will require on the part of South Africans themselves a wide acquaintance with conditions and approaches in other advanced countries. And solution will be easier if there is understanding elsewhere for the nature and depth of these problems, and a disposition among qualified people in other countries to contribute where they can to their solution by peaceful and constructive means rather than simply calling, as many now do, for immediate majority rule or for a mass uprising of non-whites and, by implication in either case, for a bloody and disastrous civil war.

It is here, of course, that the Exchange Program comes in; and it is on these foundations -- a willingness on the part of the foreigner to respect the depth and recalcitrance of South Africa's problems, and a willingness of South Africans to respect the reactions of at least the well-intentioned foreign visitor and to recognize in them a challenge that one must not wholly disregard -- it is on these foundations that the work of the Exchange Program must proceed. The Program serves as a tenuous link between two worlds of thought and feeling which are now in danger of becoming wholly estranged from each other. Were this to occur, both sides would stand to lose; but South Africa, it seems to me, would stand to lose most, for her geographic isolation is already an inalterable fact, and she has particular need of a highly-developed relationship of human community with other countries to counter-balance it.

I have an idea that the present juncture may be the most difficult one we shall know, in the relations between South Africa and other western countries -- "the moment of greatest darkness just before dawn." I do not have the impression that things in South Africa are going to remain unchanged. I see that country as embraced in a slow but far-

reaching crisis -- a crisis of conflict between the complex heritage of the past and the understandable determination of a white minority to retain its cultural and racial identity, on the one hand, and the requirement of a highly-advanced and sophisticated economy, on the other hand, for the full and fair integration of the entire population of the country into its life and its rhythm, both as producers and consumers, and on terms that give to all its members an adequate sense of opportunity and possibility for self-fulfillment. That the impact of these contradictory impulses has produced inequities, hardships, and painful maladjustments, not to speak of injustices, seems apparent to every foreign visitor; and I have encountered few South Africans who did not themselves reveal both an awareness of, and some degree of unhappiness over, this state of affairs. I myself have sufficient confidence in the white population of South Africa -- and not just in its ingenuity but also in its sense of moral obligation -- to believe that it will eventually cope with this crisis and surmount it. I am convinced that a portion at least of the inhibitions which have seemed to prevent progress in recent years rest on historical trauma which are rapidly losing their validity and on anxieties which are exaggerated and redundant. I think this is becoming increasingly apparent to South African people, and that they will eventually find means of divesting themselves of these superfluous impedimenta and of clearing the way for a more hopeful attack on these bitter problems.

The prerequisites for change seem therefore to me to be present, at least from the South African side; and if change begins from the South African side, then I think it likely that the worm of western-liberal prejudice and rejection will also eventually be induced to turn. What is important at this moment is that people should not despair too soon, and that there should be kept in existence, through this difficult and crucial period, at least a modicum of friendly and constructive international contacts on which one can begin to build when greater possibilities present themselves.

This is, as I see it, the purpose which the Exchange Program was designed to serve and is serving; and I would like to record, together with my gratitude to the Program for what it has enabled me to see and learn of South African life, my conviction of its importance to both our countries, my high opinion of its usefulness, and my confidence in its future.

REPORT ON PROFESSOR AND MRS. L. GORDENKER'S VISIT TO SOUTH AFRICA

PURPOSE OF VISIT:

The primary purpose of the visit to South Africa was to learn as much as possible about university teaching and research in international affairs and foreign policy. Although South Africa has been the object of numerous policies adopted by international organisations and has quite recently made the transition from a Commonwealth country to the status of a largely unattached state, it appeared to me that little systematic study and research has been devoted to its foreign relations. Moreover, discussion on foreign affairs appeared thin, subject to little variation and unappealing to large publics.

Using these tentative observations as hypotheses, I came to South Africa to learn more about professional activities in the field of foreign and international affairs and, at the same time, further to develop my knowledge of the substance of South African international relations. Because of my background as a student of international organisation and politics, I assumed I would have easy access to relevant university faculty members and that from them, reading and observation, I could sample a distillation of knowledge about the subject. Furthermore, the study of foreign affairs touches closely on my own main interest -- the study of international organisation -- a subject which could be assumed to have some importance to my South African counterparts.

Secondary purposes of my visit included:

1. Closer acquaintance with the academic and research climate in South African universities. A vocal group of academics in the United States, abhorring both the purpose and administration of the South African government's racial policies, insists that contact with South African universities directly or indirectly serves to strengthen an immoral regime and to subvert genuine scholarship. Better knowledge of South African universities could help in deciding on the substance of such criticism.
2. Gaining a broader knowledge of South African politics and society. The policies of the United States government toward South Africa may quite likely become the subject of wider public debate in the

next few years. I assumed that there was no surfeit of Americans informed about South Africa and that an additional voice might prove welcome in future discussions.

3. Rounding out my acquaintance with Africa. During the last year, I taught at Makerere University College in Kampala and lectured at The University College, Dar-es-Salaam. I also have visited Zambia and Malawi. East and Central African countries have a special and, sometimes despite themselves, close relationship with South Africa. It seemed a valuable goal to observe this relationship from the southern vantage point to parallel my earlier observations from the north.

METHOD OF VISIT:

In order to achieve the purpose of the visit, it seemed wise to try to meet colleagues in as many of the South African universities as possible. Informal discussions with faculty members interested in foreign affairs were arranged for me at most of the South African universities. (I visited all but Potchefstroom University, the University of the Orange Free State, the University of Zululand and the University of the North.) I made no public addresses but did lecture and lead seminars in small, specialist groups. Usually I relied on questioning and listening. It was not my aim to promote any policy position or to alter anyone's views, no matter how much my private opinions may have conflicted with some comments that were made to me.

In addition to visiting Universities, I interviewed a number of leading editors with whose professional milieu I am familiar and sympathetic. In addition, I talked with leading foreign affairs specialists in politics, some of them members of the legislature and some not.

In a number of instances, my hosts in universities were kind enough to arrange dinner parties and other social occasions where quiet conversation could be carried on. These proved admirable opportunities to broaden my acquaintance with South Africans, including a very few non-whites, and to get an introduction to the hopes and fears that influence private lives.

Finally, whenever possible, I visited libraries and book stores in order to get some understanding of what people were reading and what was available to them.

OUTCOME OF VISIT:

In general, the purposes of the visit were fulfilled. Both the quantity and quality of my information on the study of international affairs in South Africa have been greatly advanced. Moreover, I now know personally a great many of the leading students of international affairs and many others in the law and political and social science faculties. I have formed some conclusions as to the nature of scholarship and training in South African universities, and I believe I have a more balanced and sensitive understanding of South African politics and foreign policy. I feel that I can speak on these subjects with greater authority and depth of understanding and that I have the beginnings of yet more expertness to be based on further study.

TEACHING:

The most general comment on teaching of international affairs in South Africa is that it is neither highly developed nor fully current. It suffers generally from a parochialism which relies on a view of South Africa as a central point in international affairs and as the selected target of the foreign policies of the great powers. Some marked exceptions to this generalisation can, of course, be found, but in my opinion it remains valid for the vast majority of those who study international affairs, including international law. Furthermore, some universities either do not teach courses on international politics or else devote only part of a political science course to this field. As for the study of foreign policy as such, I do not recall hearing of any specialised course on the subject, either based on South African foreign policies or on a comparative approach. Rather, foreign policy is studied as part of more general international relations courses.

With some exceptions, the international relations courses contain largely historical material and less of the newer analytical theoretical approaches. Where such approaches are essayed, the most common is the power theory, which belongs to an earlier, if honorable, phase of the study in the United States. The use of standard text books, such as Morgenthau's and Hartmann's works, in this connection is usual. There seems to be relatively little use of readers (collections of articles and excerpts from books, systematically organised) and journal articles, as is common in the North American universities.

As for specialised study of international organisation, this is hardly undertaken at all. Typically, international organisation is dealt with as a part of a general course on international relations or tangentially in international law courses. The treatment of the subject necessarily remains introductory and superficial and in many instances is coloured by

particularistic and partisan viewpoints based on South African foreign policy. I found little sophisticated knowledge of international organisation activity outside the field of peace and security. Access to good collections of international organisation materials appears restricted only to the largest and oldest of the university libraries and in most places only secondary materials are available. It was rather taken aback on more than one occasion to find that partisan journalistic accounts, based on a conspiracy theory of international organisation, were accepted as scholarship despite patently tendentious writing and doctoring of sources. I had earlier thought that the only market for such writing could be found among reactionary political groups who believed that the American purity of Los Angeles or Dallas was seriously threatened by propaganda from UNESCO and spies from United Nations headquarters.

These generalisations had least validity (but still some) at the University of the Witwatersrand and the two universities in Pretoria. At Witwatersrand especially, the Professor of International Relations has planned courses that will put students in touch with newer approaches to international politics, such as systems theory, elite interaction, quantitative measurement, etc. While I might not always agree with the particular emphases of such courses, they seemed pointed in a direction that would produce well-informed students and researchers.

Post-graduate studies in the international field appear to have less development and popularity than do those at the undergraduate level. As yet, few post-graduate students seek higher degrees in international relations. The consequence is a paucity of seminars and of specialised study opportunities. Moreover, the possibilities for field research are limited in several ways. According to my informants in most universities, few precedents exist to argue for the admission of post-graduate students to archives and records in the hands of the civil service. Little has been done with interviews of participants in the foreign policy process and in international relations. South African students cannot do direct field research in most other African countries which will not admit white South African nationals. On the whole, I found research in progress on international relations subjects limited and confined primarily to work on unfinished dissertations.

My recent experience with the East African universities suggests a comparison between international studies there and in South Africa. It is not my intention to make invidious comparisons but rather to suggest the degree of conformity to what I conceive of as the highest professional standard. I believe that in general the East African universities have more contact with advanced international studies elsewhere and

have more interest in high grade post-graduate studies than almost all of the South African universities. The East African universities have ready access to a wide variety of publications, including the documentation of organisations frowned upon by the South African government. It is a striking fact, however, that their lack of material and ignorance of South African affairs closely parallels the South African level of information about them.

INTERNATIONAL LAW TEACHING:

The interest in studying public international law, I was informed, hardly can be called enthusiastic. Courses in public international law are widely offered as part of law studies and are available to political science and other social scientists in many, but not all, universities. Because legal reasoning underlies much of the international stance of the South African government with regard to its racial policies, I would have thought that public international law would have had a much stronger appeal than it evidently does. It seems possible that a reluctance on the part of some instructors to deal with the more controversial aspects of international law, especially with regard to the development of international legal doctrines that run contrary to the policy of apartheid, may reduce potential interest in the subject.

It probably is fair to view the approach to international legal studies in South Africa as divided. On the one hand can be found a highly conventional positivist approach. To this is frequently added an insistency on narrow textual interpretations. The consequence is a conservative, legalistic perception of international law and little appreciation of attempts to expand its scope and its penetration into the national state. This approach can easily be used to support a legalistic defence of South African policies from outside criticism. The majority of international law teachers I met preferred this approach and professed to be mystified by more flexible approaches to international law.

On the other hand can be found a rather vocal handful of law teachers who approach international law on the basis of a neo-natural law theory or on the basis of the social context of law. Because of their emphasis on the needs of the international system for norms, they tend to be more appreciative of the legal outcome of international organisation processes and of the possibility of modifying international law and commitments under it to accord with new conditions. This group of lawyers has much more sympathy with developments in contemporary legal studies in North America and Western Europe than does the positivist school. They are moreover much more likely to criticise present governmental

policies than the positivists, whose emphasis on authoritative decision induces them to give lesser attention to fundamental questions of justice.

Because my few lectures and seminars raised questions of legal interpretation of United Nations resolutions and commitments under the Charter, I soon became aware of the sharp difference of opinion in academic circles on the approach to international law. Many law teachers showed a strong defensiveness in connection even with a description of doctrines which they did not endorse. Although I did not advocate a position but merely described and analysed the doctrines underlying the attitude of the vast majority of United Nations members on racial discrimination, colonialism and the racial policies of South Africa, it became apparent to me that many of the lawyers I talked with relied on legalistic defences of South African policies. They showed less sensitivity to the political factors which produce attempts to set new international norms for the behaviour of states. It was suggested several times by implication or directly that the attitude of the majority of governments in the world stemmed from the conspiratorial machinations of the Soviet Union and China.

RESEARCH:

Research in South Africa on international relations, international law and related political and social questions presents a number of problems, both to South Africans and foreigners. To begin with, it was universally stated that some subjects are "too sensitive" for researchers to touch. While there was less unanimity on the precise definition of these subjects, those mentioned included military strategy, the effects of foreign-based revolutionary movements on South African policies and society, political attitudes of members of the non-white population, the operation of the foreign affairs bureaucracy, political controversy on the legal position of South Africa in international politics, policies and legal problems related to South-West Africa, political relationships with Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories, South African policies in the United Nations and the new outward-looking démarches of the South African government. I was told repeatedly by staff members in various universities, both English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking, that controversial questions related to these subjects were difficult to deal with in classrooms and that publications related to them were subject to social and official pressure. It is, however, not clear to me whether all the limitations implied by such statements are in fact real or whether they are perceived by researchers on their own judgments. But in either case, the belief that research on sensitive matters is impossible, subject to sanction or discouraged by the political atmosphere cannot help limiting learning.

It is also evident that academic experts on international questions generally have little contact with either the foreign affairs bureaucracy or the foreign affairs specialists of political parties. Only a very few academics appear to serve as consultants on international problems. Thus, access to interesting research material or even knowledge of its existence is limited. Furthermore, at least some members of the academic community expressed resentment against colleagues who publish critical articles in foreign publications. Yet South African academic journals do not appear to carry many critical articles on foreign affairs or international legal questions. Moreover, some academics interpret the recent contempt case against Dr. B. van Niekerk, growing out of his publication of the results of a questionnaire to the legal profession on their perception of the application of the death penalty, as a warning against publishing on controversial questions of any kind.

How much a non-South African researcher could accomplish in South Africa on controversial international affairs questions is not clear to me. It appears likely that a researcher dealing with historical materials, especially those beyond the reach of the 50-year embargo on governmental archives, should have little trouble. Researchers dealing with current problems of interest to social scientists probably would find more difficulties.

These difficulties consist of three types. The first arises when a visa is sought. Researchers, including advanced post-graduate students working under close academic supervision on dissertations, often encounter long delays before visas are granted and in some instances, the Ministry of Interior refuses them altogether. There is no need to insist that several researchers with high reputations outside of South Africa for profundity and scientific detachment have failed to obtain visas. No explanations are made in such instances.

The second problem arises after the researcher, having received his visa, appears in South Africa and seeks access to his material. Special permits are necessary to conduct research in geographical locations assigned to non-white populations, whether urban or rural. It is not made clear in advance whether access will be granted to a researcher. In several instances of which I have personal knowledge, a carefully-designed research project had to be changed because of problems of access. Much less difficulty appears to exist with regard to political and social problems among the white population of South Africa.

The third difficulty, certainly not unique to South Africa

but in my estimation visibly present there, arises from a defensive attitude toward criticism. Civil servants, politicians and some academics with whom I have had contact have insisted that such outsiders as they took me to represent do not understand South Africa; they thereupon set out to correct misconceptions. But to my questions which implied answers that could be used critically in assessing governmental social policy, I frequently got polemic replies based on National Party doctrine. It is also hard to avoid the conclusion that interviews with scientifically-oriented researchers are a rarity for many civil servants and political leaders. Such interviews do lead to critical comments: research inevitably raises the possibility of criticism, some of it fundamental, and this must be accepted by those involved in the subject of research if anything worthwhile is to emerge.

In connection with research by non-South Africans, it is germane to note that some researchers from countries which do not practice racial discrimination are unlikely to be welcome in South Africa. This applies with great force to Black Americans.

INTELLECTUAL CONTACT:

A proposition usually accepted by academics and intellectuals favours the maintenance of intellectual contact, no matter what political gulfs divide the thinkers of different lands. Almost all South Africans with whom I talked strongly supported this proposition as basic to honest intellectual endeavour and to the advancement of science. Only one person, an avowed opponent of the present South African government and despairing of change changing its policies from within, supported an intellectual boycott as a means of putting pressure on the government.

That many South African academics enjoy, support and believe in the benefits of intellectual exchange was evident from the large number that I met who had studied or done research abroad. It is also clear that a large proportion of the best undergraduates go abroad for further training and that a considerably proportion of them never returns. In both English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking universities, almost universal support was expressed for post-graduate study abroad, especially in the United States for social sciences and international studies.

It was also unmistakable that South African academics eagerly sought discussion and continued contact with a visitor from American universities. Rather often such discussions brought out rather plaintive comments about the isolation of South African universities, the difficulty of getting and financing extended leaves and the necessity of teaching a far

larger number of classes and students than is common in North American or Western European universities. This situation, in turn, restricts research and thus contact with other academics. The strong interest in academic contact, I may add, found expression in a warm welcome for me in every university I visited.

Although it may be a fact that academics both in South Africa and in most other places strongly support free exchange among members of their community, this does not dispose of all related problems. Some academics in the United States (and at least one in South Africa) seriously support a complete boycott of South Africa on the grounds that its racial policies are unjust and immoral and that the strength of government and administration have foreclosed both effective criticism and change. Their argument continues that South Africans profit from the resources, training and intellectual accomplishments outside of the country only in order to strengthen their immoral practices, not for the purposes of increasing scientific knowledge. Non-white South Africans, moreover, rarely get permission and financial backing for study and research abroad so that only that part of the population which benefits from the immoral system gains from intellectual contact.

While I personally believe that this argument confuses description with policy prescription and that its descriptions are too flatly stated to be useful, the difficulties with research noted above do not make it easier to argue the case of intellectual contact. Nor does the fact that some of the leading scholarly works in the social sciences cannot legally be imported into South Africa or quoted in publications circulated in South Africa help in the argument. Nor is there any comfort in the special difficulties non-whites from abroad and from South Africa encounter in academic studies and research in the country.

I can see little reason for the acute sensitivity, noted above, on the part of the South African government and some academics. If South Africa is embarked on policies that promise as much as the official statements of the government and its supporters say, it need not fear criticism from outsiders, who, incidentally, do not in any case vote. (The criticism of foreigners upsets few in the United States; indeed Americans have a long tradition of learning from such foreign critics as de Tocqueville, Bryce, Simone de Beauvoir, Louis Heren and numerous others.) If the South African government enjoys the support it claims for the policies so commonly criticised elsewhere, it will not be hurt by research done on scientific basis. If such research does raise fundamental questions which have gone unanswered, it would be a prudent policy to define them and seek answers before irreparable damage is done.

Some South African academics have told me that American scholars and journalists have been unfair, uninformed and polemical in their writing on South African social problems. They therefore should not be permitted to do further research in South Africa. This is no useful argument. I can think of no open society where some published material is not unfair, polemical or uninformed. Correcting the faults of other scholars is an important task in academic discourse. If South African scholars cannot manage that task they have no claim to academic competence and therefore little argument for contact with academics abroad.

There is a strong case, which I support conditionally, to be made for continued and intensified academic contact with South Africa. South African universities do provide education and intellectual broadening for future leaders, even if the Whites are greatly favoured as compared with non-whites. The young people of South Africa can only benefit from as broad an introduction to their worlds as they can absorb. Contact among foreign and South African academics probably will help to ensure that breadth is maintained in university courses. This result cannot be obtained, of course, only from contact; it is still possible to stifle critical thinking and thus to kill the essential spirit of the university. But so far this critical spirit endures, in spite of undeniable pressures, and may even be increasing.

Furthermore, South Africa has undertaken a vast program of social engineering which creates problems and tensions of great interest to academic social scientists. The administration of South African racial policies begs for intense academic scrutiny. The South African position in international politics has a similar attractiveness to scholars. Academic contact could and should further research along these lines. Some South African academics have assured me that they would welcome more outside researchers who wished to use their universities as a base for their inquiries.

Nevertheless, I would not support unconditionally continued contact between American and South African university personnel nor an eternal welcome for an unlimited number of South Africans in American universities. So many obstacles to research, a free inquiry and unlimited learning by both foreigners and South Africans exist in the South African milieu that it is doubtful that intellectual contact now takes place on the basis of mutuality.

I believe South African universities should be pressed to seek freer conditions for academic researchers from abroad. This would provide for a greater reciprocity. I would also attempt on every possible

occasion to demonstrate that reprisals against American academics who publish material that runs counter to dogma accepted by South African government do not go unnoticed. If these approaches produce no results, I would favour reducing academic opportunities for South Africans in the United States.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

The South Africans I met during my nearly six weeks of travel and visiting without exception gave me and my family a cordial welcome and showed deep interest in our questions. We are all grateful to them for their kindness and their willingness to endure questioning.

Most of the universities opened their doors fully to me. I was able to meet everyone connected with my field of study who was anywhere in the neighbourhood. In almost every place some (but is it ever enough?) time was provided for discussions with my counterparts and with people in allied fields. In most instances, I was also given a chance to visit libraries.

My visit unfortunately overlapped with university examinations or, in the case of non-white universities, with vacations. Consequently, my direct contact with students was perhaps more limited than it ideally should have been. Nevertheless, I did get an opportunity to talk with several students at different stages of study. In several instances, informal discussions with students and young faculty members were arranged. These proved particularly valuable.

In Johannesburg, Pretoria, Stellenbosch, Cape Town, Grahamstown and Durban, we were also able to meet families outside of university circles. This gave us extra insight into the life of South Africa and permitted me to view university affairs from a different angle. I met many leading members of the legal profession and found their comments of very high value. Their knowledge of governmental administrative processes which affect the lives of South African residents and of the administration of justice touched on some of the liveliest questions asked abroad about South Africa.

Interviews with newspaper editors also proved to have great value, both in giving some insight into South African thought and in explaining the role of and limitations on the press in South Africa. On one occasion, through the kindness of the South African Institute of International Affairs, a half dozen editors gathered to carry on a free-flowing discussion of foreign affairs with me. This meeting in particular demonstrated the range of

opinion among Afrikaans-speaking journalists.

The least satisfactory visits to universities were to those for non-white students. It was unfortunate that Fort Hare and the Indian university at Durban were on vacation during my visit. Illness prevented a visit to the University of Zululand. At the University of the Western Cape I met no students and only two staff members; at the Indian university I met only the Rector. The conversations at the non-white universities were informative, especially at Fort Hare, where the Professor of Political Science gave a great deal of time and energy to showing us around. Yet it is perfectly clear to me and admitted by some of those with whom I talked that relations between staff and students is a guarded one. It suggests the hypothesis that the establishment of non-white universities has reduced contact among members of different races, for all the weight given by some advocates of apartheid to relations among the elites of the various racial groups (as defined legally in South Africa). A further hypothesis is that racial groups represent widely-separated poles of opinion in South Africa. The student disorders at Fort Hare some 18 months ago tend to lend credence to these hypotheses. I would have welcomed an opportunity to discuss these thoughts with non-white faculty members and students.

It was not my intention in coming to South Africa to probe into non-white society beyond contact through universities. My schedule, so admirably worked out by USSALEP, concentrated on universities. Yet in retrospect it is clear to me that I should have sought more discussion with non-whites, for their very numbers imply a greater future role in the universities and special problems for them. A slight glimpse of some of the problems came to me in the Transkei, where a discussion with officials made it clear that the output from Fort Hare neither sufficed to staff a growing administrative service nor provided enthusiastic support for a major governmental scheme.

The visit to the Transkei, by the way, graphically illustrated how much development, following a policy of apartheid or not, still lies ahead for the non-white population of South Africa. After living in the lush agricultural areas of Uganda and seeing the advanced farming of Kenyans, I was shocked by the poverty and primitiveness of the Transkei. The shock began at the borders of the area, where in a few minutes one passed from good farms to poverty-stricken, eroded fields. I enjoyed no other opportunity to inspect a non-white rural area, but my reading indicates they are no better than the Transkei.

The needs of the Transkei, coupled with complaints in the

(white) newspapers about the level of taxation, made me wonder how great a proportion of the resources under their control the white population of South Africa would actually commit to the policy of separate development. Whether one supports such a policy or not, it is quite clear that it cannot come close to achieving its stated goals without massive investment. Yet in the Transkei a senior civil servant (whose influence is unmistakable) spoke of the impossibility of forcing the pace. In my view, rapid economic development must include "forcing the pace," otherwise the circular strangulation of underdevelopment endures endlessly. Furthermore, even if it were intended greatly to speed the pace of development, the question remains as to whether the white electorate would be willing to pay.

As for the non-white locations around the major industrial areas, I can hardly claim to have given them much study. An officially directed tour or two hardly constitutes much useful direct experience. Because there was no opportunity to speak with residents, it is hard to comment on their attitudes. It is clear that a considerable amount of housing has been built, but it is not clear whether the total supply of housing per person has increased for the urban populations, which appear to have a large number of illegal residents among them. (In addition, there remains the fundamental question of the justice of such housing schemes.) I cannot, however, accept the claim by some officials I met in the course of my visit that no other African country does as well for its residents. Aside from the irrelevance of this claim in the South African context, it simply betrays ignorance of the vast housing schemes to be seen in Zambia, Kenya and Uganda and it takes no account of the ability of anyone there to live where his means permit and anywhere land is for sale or lease.

After some minutes of conversation in South Africa, almost everyone with whom I talked asked: "What do you think of this country?" The question involves too much for a short answer and a long one requires much thought and study. Often I temporarily contented myself and my questioner with the comment that South Africa had complex problems to deal with. This was often followed by sober head-wagging and the observation that the rest of the world did not appreciate South African problems.

The reality of South Africa no doubt comprises even greater complexity than many observers would admit. But the complexity is not, as many in South Africa assured me it was, the result of proximity of people of different races - or to put it in a more sophisticated way, of cultures with different fundamental values and patterns of action. The interaction among different cultures would, of course, produce problems. But South Africa has itself added to the complexity of its situation by deliberately setting out to reconstruct itself along the lines of an explicit

doctrine. To administer this doctrine of apartheid implies the removal of long-settled people from their homes, denial of the values of some of these people, far-reaching revisions in education and training, definition of permissible employment for various groups, urban and rural planning and a hundred other actions. Such programming cannot help but cause friction and tension. It is the feeling that South Africa is permeated by an underlying tension that forms one of my most vivid impressions.

This tension and the prospects of alleviating it furnished the agenda for many casual conversations with South Africans, including the few non-whites with whom I talked. I had anticipated a more monolithic sort of opinion than I actually encountered. In fact, I found a considerable range of opinion. Among the Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, I expected to hear only an orthodox line which closely followed National Party doctrines. But Afrikaners with whom I talked often deviated considerably from the government position and a good many were highly critical of the more annoying aspects of apartheid, such as separate lifts for non-whites in public buildings. A few openly doubted the possibility of long-term success for apartheid and many doubted its success without massive sacrifices on the part of the white population. But there was no lack of orthodox opinion; on one occasion, the memory of which I value greatly, some remarks I made about the United Nations were refuted point-by-point along National Party lines by the dignitary who was selected to offer the vote of thanks. It was also clear that relatively few Afrikaners published critical material in the Afrikaans general circulation press. (It was a great help to me that I could read this press.) In general, however, only rarely did I hear from Afrikaners any direct opposition to the apartheid doctrine; criticism of governmental policies usually remained within the limits of that policy.

Among English-speaking South Africans, I heard more direct criticism of the policy of apartheid. But this is not to say that all or most English-speakers oppose leadership by a white minority. Some few do so directly; others apparently would do so if they did not feel threatened by legal and administrative restrictions on dissenting opinion. Under less restrictive circumstances, they would no doubt be joined by some Afrikaners who now must also deal with sharp social pressure directed against some political dissent.

In any case, my observations lead me to accept that among the Afrikaner community, especially among its intellectuals, a considerable ferment is now in process. It is worth attention - more than it gets from outsiders - and it is too complicated to be described with the simple journalistic terms of verligte and verkrampste. But it would be unwise to assume

that the ferment has already produced a definite product. Strong pressures toward orthodoxy, emanating from government, church and universities, remain.

My visit coincided with the flowering of Mr. Vorster's outward-looking foreign policy. I could hardly have had a better moment to observe this development on the ground in South Africa. Mr. Vorster's trips easily stimulated discussion about South African foreign policy and the place of the Republic in international affairs. It would be less than frank of me to claim that I found a numerous, well-informed foreign affairs constituency which brought accurate and profound knowledge to discussions. Above all, defensiveness characterised the views expressed to me. South Africa was viewed as under exceedingly hard attack from abroad. When I asked precisely how South Africa was hurt by these attacks, the replies were often bewildered. Knowledge of politics in East and central Africa is slight and frequently allegations reveal extreme distortion, matched by ignorance. It is clear to me that the government is subjected to little skeptical questioning, that parliamentary debates are thin and that the press fails, despite some sincere efforts, either to inform accurately or stimulate discussion among wider publics. This is all the more surprising in view of the general acceptance of the idea that South Africa is embattled, that the majority in the United Nations seeks only to damage South Africa through illegal means, that thousands of guerilla fighters (one editor stated publicly that 20,000 were being readied and no one in the audience demanded to know the source of such interesting information) are in training and that South Africa is the object of a Communist-inspired onslaught. Such opinions demand discussion. If they are based on fallacies or misapprehensions the consequences for the country could be severe. Yet for the most part, the discussion I encountered was disappointingly thin and usually poorly informed.

The conclusion of this report cannot be a line of praise for everything South African. I have consciously tried to exercise critical faculties in order to learn. I believe I have learned much and understood more about South Africa than before the visit. In this sense, the visit accomplished what it was designed to do and the many kind South Africans I met can feel satisfied that their efforts had a beneficial effect.

REPORT ON DR. WILTON S. DILLON'S VISIT TO SOUTH AFRICA

I. Professional Perspectives

Scientists in South Africa and the rest of the world stand to benefit by an "outward policy" which removes obstacles to cooperation, and contributes to making South Africa, and other societies, function as "intellectual free trade zones." In even the most open societies, science and scholarship require a two-way flow with the outside world, preferably on a face-to-face basis to complement written communication. Isolation inhibits scientists and slows down their contributions to knowledge and human welfare.

Because of the stigma attached to South African racial arrangements, South African scientists of European origin have difficulty carrying on their work in the rest of the African continent. Black African governments deny their own scientists easy communication with South African colleagues. Official South African policies require black African scientists to request scientific information through their governments in order to "give credit to the source." White South African scholars sometimes feel snubbed at international congresses in Europe or America.

On June 7, the Sunday Times reported that Prof. Jerome Bruner of Harvard University turned down an invitation to lecture at a seminar on child development in South Africa because he "could not appease his conscience by working in South Africa with its present racial policies." He did this against his own professional self-interest in learning about important psychological research going on in South Africa. Scientists with pigmentation of non-Caucasoid hues, or from countries with Marxist orientations, are not encouraged to participate in scientific meetings in South Africa. Sociologists from Southern Africa depend on Lourenco Marques as a site for scholarly discourse. (In the U.S., the Justice Department recently overruled the Department of State in denying a visa on ideological grounds to a Belgian philosopher to lecture in an American university.)

Despite such clouds over a free exchange of ideas, hypotheses and data, anthropologists and other scientists can enjoy considerable professional enrichment by visiting South Africa. Already exploited as a natural laboratory par excellence, in view of her rich fauna and flora,

South Africa's diverse human resources make it one of the great anthropological capitals of the world. Fossil remains of early tool-making and tool-using man -- the precursors to technology that made moon travel possible -- combined with superlative research facilities for studying contemporary human and other animal behavior, in a variety of environments, explain part of the appeal of South Africa as an essential part of the world scientific community.

All that I have seen in South Africa's museums, excavation sites, research laboratories of government and industry, universities, and game reserves will contribute to my helping plan a Museum of Man and improve existing resources at the Smithsonian. Moreover, my visit has re-inforced my belief, long held during my work with the Africa Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, that pan-African science co-operation is vital to man's knowledge of tropical environments and their potential contribution toward solving world food and population problems. South Africa's research on human adaptability, part of its contribution to the International Biological Program, is yet another boon to the human and biological sciences. Space, marine, and medical sciences in the U.S. have long been beneficiaries of knowledge originating here.

In the natural sciences, engineering, and research supporting the health professions, South Africa can contribute to a whole range of problems related to reducing pollution, improving the quality of the physical environment, and understanding the processes by which man upsets the balance of nature. The experiments on re-cycling of water, control of the tse-tse fly, rinderpest, tests for amoebic invasions of the human body, an anti-kwashiorkor protein supplement (Pronutro) -- not to mention organ transplants -- are only a few illustrations of scientific, technical, and medical achievements in South Africa which have been built on scientific work elsewhere and which, in turn, enriches the world's patrimony of knowledge capable of making this planet more fit for human habitation. Recent South African discoveries about the enrichment of uranium dramatize even more the need for recognizing, and making ethical use of, the benefits of knowledge coming out of the tip of the African continent.

Daniel Greenberg's series of articles in Science, the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (July 10, July 17, and August 7) provide more systematic and comprehensive reporting on the South African science scene and how its scientists operate in the context of separate development.

I am a member of a privileged minority, because of my links with major scientific institutions, to have a chance to test out, personally, my own adherence to a principle vital to world welfare: the

principle of free circulation of scientists and scientific information. While ideological and political factors inhibit science everywhere, I have had the liberating experience of direct communication now with scientists and scholars from almost every side of intellectual barriers: I have had the chance to see that ideal scientific endeavor, like the spread of early Christianity, recognizes no color bar, or condition of political servitude. Truth-seeking, via the scientific method, follows the same procedures in Peking, Taipei, Pretoria, Paris, Tuskegee, Moscow, Accra, Frankfurt, Tel Aviv or Cairo. Paradoxically, I could not have had direct access to the riches of science in South Africa without being Caucasian, or a white Japanese, and few South African scientists can have access to scientific communities north of the Limpopo because they are white and come from South Africa. When I go to East or West Africa, I can meet African scientists who enjoy free access to the research communities of both mainland and offshore China. Because of the policies of my government, I am "punished" by being refused access to the Peking Academy, but welcomed by the Academia Sinica of Taipei. We Americans have to depend on our Tanzanian or Ghanaian colleagues, not to mention the Canadians, British or French, as intermediaries in communicating with Peking or Shanghai scientists. Frenchmen from the Institut Pasteur in Paris help Americans keep in touch with scientific work (immunology) in Hanoi.

In such an imperfect world, my South African experience has strengthened inter-related observations made first in other contexts:

- 1) Being a human institution, science, like the church, manifests much nonrational behavior.
- 2) It is unreasonable to expect rationality and self-interest to operate as a constant in science, politics, or religion.
- 3) Scientists and other intellectuals are not free from primitive fears of guilt by association.
- 4) Moral outrage, fear, prestige, or political gain often take higher priorities than policies which would protect the free flow of ideas between and within societies.
- 5) Despite nonrationality and official interference, academicians share with businessmen impressive skills, imagination, and inventiveness in pursuit of their goals of increasing knowledge, and economic growth. It is difficult to keep them away from finding their trading partners, whether for ideas or goods.

II. Cross-Cultural Perspectives

With strikingly similar national histories, allowing for dramatic contrasts, how can space age leaders of the United States and South Africa learn new understandings of what is meant by enlightened self-interests of both these complex, plural, industrial republics?

As a patriot of the United States, and a participant in some of its major non-governmental institutions, I find that six weeks of exposure to the hospitable, gracious, and well-intentioned society of white South Africans makes me feel less alone in the world. I realize that the United States is not the only society which does not always act in its total best interests.

We share these and other characteristics: (1) Insufficient effort to seek out the talent and potential of all our human resources; (2) failure to recognize the positive values of cultural pluralism for the whole society (not merely the "protection" of cultural differences for particular races or ethnicities -- one person described "apartheid" as insurance against the cultural equivalent of genocide); (3) innocence of leaders about how admission of error can be interpreted as a sign of strength and the basis of popular support; and (4) a certain difficulty in developing the kind of humor in high places which could match that of the British Tourist Office which, during the visit of the royal family to Italy in 1961, urged Romans to visit London where, despite the absence of sunshine, good food, and romantic architecture, the tourist was sure to have fun "because we are all mad."

The open hand signal of a London traffic policeman was perceived years ago by a Swazi visitor as the traditional Swazi gesture of greeting and hospitality, and he felt warmly toward his London experience. This classic story of F. Bartlett in a social psychology textbook illustrates "selective perception." It comes to mind as my family and I realize that we, like the Swazi, have selected out of our encounter with South Africa those elements which strike us as familiar or strange according to our life histories. Allen Drury's perceptions in A Very Strange Society were fashioned by his previous experience, and what he faithfully recorded from South African narratives. As white American Southerners, with long residence in that old Dutch and British colony, New York, and in Ghana, the ancestral land of many of our fellow Southerners, our best approach to report "objectively" about South Africa is to allude to the backgrounds out of which our perceptions are filtered.

My wife and I, though now in the mainstream of American life, are products of childhood experience that give us "bi-focal vision"

or a relativistic view of persons, their actions, and events. She is a Virginian, and I, an Oklahoman with deep roots in Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi, and both now citizens of Virginia, have always lived among contradictions of the ideal and the real. Conflicting claims on our loyalties were made by family, church, the Southern region, and the nation-state. Like Americans of African ancestry, we are old Americans. For different reasons than black Americans, we do not regard ourselves as European.

Western civilization as an organizing framework, or as a definition of our larger sense of community, long ago disappeared in the wake of my strong identities with Japan and other parts of the "non-Western" world.

Sir Kenneth Clark's celebrated BBC-TV film series, "Civilisation," would be worth seeing from the South African whites' perspective. Without denying pride in Western ancestry, I was constantly surprised by the pre-occupation of white South Africans with the very concept of Western civilization -- as though "Western" and "civilization" are synonymous. "Western" to me had come to mean "modern," if applied to Asians, Africans, or American Indians and Negroid Americans, and had lost its color content. So, coming from a multi-racial, "multi-national" society, where Hopi Indians have TV antennae on adobe huts, and blacks and whites make up a "sub-nation" called the South and share a common culture, I felt uncomfortable in being reminded that my country was the "leader of Western civilization." (The phrase put boundaries around my country, defined our "territory" in a different way, making us responsible for upholding the truths of Plato, Dante, Erasmus, Louis XIV, and Einstein, not to mention the Dutch Reformed and Anglican Churches. Other societies seemingly would have to put out flags for Buddha, Confucius, Akbar -- or Mao.) I felt burdened, moreover, by being boxed into the parochial West, and then to be accused of being part of a system that is "letting down Western civilization" -- through "permissiveness," or allowing American blacks and "coloreds" to set troublesome examples ("Black Power" and "Black Is Beautiful") for the bantu population. The critique of the U.S. which most fascinated me came from a university official, who, though believing in a world communist monolith, nevertheless charged us with "bleeding the West by fighting a war in Indo-China."

Perhaps my own surprises -- which now cause me to re-think concepts like culture and civilization -- grow out of my own eclectic past. An Episcopalian, I once taught Buddhism and Shinto in a Unitarian Church School in New York, and as an anthropologist, wrote a book about Gaullism in France as a form of nativistic revival which I compared with

similar phenomenon in New Guinea. My wife and I are exasperatingly difficult to classify, and though we feel increasingly opinionated with advancing age, confess to love persons, or countries, capable of regarding each other as enemies. We frequently invoke the image of Rashomon, the Japanese film which celebrated multi-faceted truth, and, even in trying to provide some certainty for our eight-year-old son, find ourselves admonishing him, "It's not a case of either/or; there is another way of looking at it."

We take no pride in such looseness of thought. It is only fair, however, in commenting further on South African life, that we should confess to characteristics that are held in low esteem by a number of persons with whom we spoke. "America, the permissive society, is rotten to the core. . . . Dr. Spock has contributed to a laissez-faire approach that has undermined law and order, and helped to sap the strength of the Western world. . . . James Reston has committed subversion by daring to discuss the personal character of your president; he has helped to weaken the authority of the state. . . . Your blacks and student demos would learn to behave if you had elected Agnew earlier, and if your police enjoyed the respect we have for ours."

Hearing such remarks in South Africa, albeit from random conversations with strangers, I felt myself confronted with attitudes similar to those I remembered at home: nostalgia of neighbors and relatives for tight-knit communities ripped asunder by modern times; their fear of the unknown; their innocence about the social sources of violence or protest; holding predictably harsh attitudes against the unwashed and ill-mannered affluent youth and angry poor who seem to show little gratitude for help, or devotion to hard work and soap. (An Indian taxi driver in Durban, reading his newspaper about the wave of student protest in the U.S., proudly told me "This couldn't happen here; we would never let things get so far out of hand; if there is one place on earth that is stable, it is South Africa!")

Our visit coincided with some memorable events of May which dramatized the interdependence of our two republics, and our inability to detach ourselves from events in far-away places. Time and Newsweek were being read as avidly by South Africans as ourselves. We were, moreover, exposed to a backdrop of daily headlines, in both the English and Afrikaans press* about the war of nerves leading to the suspension of the Springbok Cricket tour of Britain (I shall never again under-

*A summer of study at the University of Leyden had equipped me with enough "skill" at reading newspaper Dutch that I had the impression I was understanding Afrikaans.

estimate the emotional, political, and moral dimensions of sports as a factor in world affairs); the shootings at Kent State University, Jackson, Mississippi, and Augusta, Georgia; the crying of my own beloved country over our newest military adventure in Cambodia; the temporary disappearance of an American naval attaché in Capetown; the sensitive responses of the Johannesburg stock market to the decline in Wall Street averages; the growing demands in South Africa for legal reforms affecting political prisoners, and wiser manpower policies to better utilize talents and skills of individuals with various ethnic backgrounds; the return of George Wallace to the Alabama governorship; and finally, the historic visits of the Prime Minister to Malawi and Europe.

With these events in the consciousness of most all of our hosts and friends, I found myself reassured that our two countries are not so isolated as some of our critics suggest. Modern mass communications and mass consumption are producing new, pragmatic approaches to notions of national sovereignty (both countries, like it or not, are affected by world opinion). Communications also alter traditional views of what "non-whites" are capable of. Rhetoric in both societies does not always match reality.

One striking example of the disparity between public rhetoric and private explanation, on one hand, and findings of behavioral scientists, on the other hand, can be found in views of certain South African and American whites about the processes of social change and plasticity of human beings. In both societies one can hear responsible officials remark, "You can't change centuries of habit (also read neglect, isolation, primitive mentality, or injustice, depending on the speaker) in a generation." This is comparable to the dictum that you cannot legislate morality, with neglect of the positive uses of the law as an instrument of education. Important research from sources in both the U.S. and South Africa suggests the opposite of the slow-change proposition: dramatic change is possible in a single generation, e.g., Margaret Mead's New Lives for Old (available in paperback to students at Witswatersrand and Rand Afrikaans University bookshops).

"The concentration of political power in the hands of the most conservative elements in southern Africa's white population has wide-ranging repercussions on American foreign policy," Vernon McKay wrote in Southern Africa and the United States. To this I would add that the domestic policies of South Africa have important implications for an understanding of wiser domestic policies for the United States. I refer to the widespread and poorly articulated concern in the U.S. over the inevitable revisions needed in our assimilationist or "melting pot" theory.

"Red power" (American Indians, of course), "black power," "poor white power," "women's liberation," "student power," and what a sociologist has recently called "intellectuals as an ethnic group" are slogans and signs of heterogeneity whose positive functions have not yet been stated. We have not yet worked out a new political anthropology of cultural diversity acceptable to politicians, scholars, "middle Americans" and other restless natives. With no intention of wanting to borrow from South Africa's Tomlinson Commission formula, I nevertheless urge my own countrymen to take a broad comparative view of cultural pluralism in a number of societies: South Africa, Indonesia, India, Yugoslavia, Canada, and the USSR, to name a few where nation-states are still evolving out of diverse cultural and ethnic mosaics. South Africa's Transkei experience, coupled with autonomous moves ahead for Zululand, would be all the more worth examining if these experiments contained two elements vital to our knowledge of human behavior, and a proper use of manpower: (1) free choice of residence; and (2) an encouragement of bi-culturalism. The latter recognizes that few human groups any place today are so isolated that they are not living bi-culturally, mixing traditional modes with the modern; there are no "pure" cultures or races. The very definition of being modern must include the capacity to handle various identities and blend cultural styles. Pictures of Tagore and Gandhi on the walls of the Afrikaans-speaking Rector of the Indian University at Durban, or an English-speaking white scientist enjoying Zulu humor, are superficial examples of the enormous amount of acculturation going on in South Africa between groups whose cultural integrity the nationalist state is protecting. Few whites in South Africa seem any more aware than U.S. whites are of the cultural impact of aboriginal populations on their ways of life. (In the U.S., of course, American Indian cultures merged with imported African slave cultures to enrich and help give the U.S. a separate identity from Europe.)

"Border industries" in South Africa have a comparable rationale to plans once favored by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs to establish jobs (e.g., electronic assembly plants) in American Indian communities. The hope, thwarted mainly by trade unions, was to keep down the growth of an urban proletariat (lessen migration to Los Angeles, Sioux Falls or Omaha), make good use of unique manpower in communities needing economic stimulus, and provide a more realistic basis for maintaining cultural "autonomy" for those who preferred to stay in their hometowns. In various discussions about South African "decentralization" of industry, I reminded South African hosts that I should regard the Smithsonian Institution in Washington as my own intellectual "border industry." As a Southerner, I prefer to live in Virginia, at least at night, and commute to a world capital by day, enjoying simultaneously the particular and

parochial, and the cosmopolitan and universal. I am fully aware, however, that such facetious parallels risk ignoring the human and financial costs of forced settlement and job assignment and ceilings in South Africa.

I am trying to suggest that a comparative view of South African and U.S. experiments with pluralism requires a temporary suspension of words like "liberal" or "conservative," or even the word "racist." What makes an economy work? What social arrangements can best celebrate free choice and the full development of human potential for the good of all? Answers to these functional or pragmatic questions ought to be sought without the burden of name-calling or false labelling. Try this out on the South African and U.S. scenes, and one can see that a dialogue has just begun. The rules of the talking game should include the demand that we watch our language while remembering that the problems are more than semantic.

The sophistication and tolerance also required in such dialogues I associate most immediately with two South Africans I met during the journey: Mr. C. M. Ndamse, Minister of Transportation in the Transkei, and Mr. M. Moerane, editor of the World in Johannesburg. Their breadth of view, candor, and sympathetic understanding of the whites' fear of population growth, and the relentlessly watched white-black ratios, may not be typical of intergroup perceptions. But they, too, are genuine products of South African society, and would be distinguished citizens of any other.

In leaving South Africa, where I was resisting praise of my government's war actions and a belated "get tough" policy toward student demonstrations, I realized that both South Africa and the United States impose heavy burdens on their citizens travelling overseas. Policies of both countries, internal or external, bring severe obstacles to communication with our world-wide critics. The Indo-China war is not comparable to apartheid but both have made our countries pariahs with much of the world. The greatest moments of pleasure in South Africa took place in conversations in which I pretended our war and apartheid did not exist.

So we left enriched, shocked, humbled, amused, warmed by compassion, love and affection, fattened, drawn to the grapes of Nederburg, and extremely impatient to welcome our South African friends to our "very strange society." When they come, I shall exploit each reunion by discussing a theme of social science fiction that I should like to write some day: the creation of a constitutional monarchy in South Africa, with rotating kingships operating like department chairmen in a university, and modern statecraft handled by a prime minister. Scratch the cultural history of

any South African, and one might find in his the social memory of nostalgia for some royalist tradition. The present equilibrium in South Africa is often explained by police and fire power. I suspect, insofar as the balancing act continues, some of the explanation also might be found in similar notions of hierarchy and authority distributed throughout the whole population, though deriving from different historical sources, e. g., British, Zulu, Xhosa, Dutch, etc. Americans, our egalitarian slogans notwithstanding, are not impervious to monarchical sentiments operating within a republican form. President Eisenhower was a kind of monarch without a prime minister; President Kennedy combined the kingly with the prime ministerial role. There is much to be said for the non-rational aspects of kingship which can appeal to common denominators in setting high, spiritual standards and attractive visions of the future, leaving the driving to the efficient technocrats whose job is to keep house, not inspire and harmonize. Is that the hopeful future for South Africa? Were we mistaken in not making George Washington our first king? Could Eleanor Roosevelt have become our first queen? South Africa sets one to wondering.